



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/577,909

05/01/2006

Hiroyuki Hirano

127851

6890

25944 7590 06/06/2008
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

PIPALA, EDWARD J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3663

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/577,909	Applicant(s) HIRANO ET AL.	
	Examiner EDWARD PIPALA	Art Unit 3663	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) EDWARD PIPALA. (3) Rodney Rothwell (Reg. No. 60,728).
 (2) Steve Jinks. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 04 June 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: primarily independent claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Loehr et al. (2003/0023407) and Toshifumi et al. (JP 7329701).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed the meaning of "load" as recited in the claims and what constitutes a greater or smaller load, and how that relates to the primary reference of Loehr et al wrt failure sensing in the control unit having a smaller control load. The examiner also indicated that arguments presented in the interview would be formally considered upon the filing of Applicant's response to the Office action mailed 5/2/08.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Edward Pipala/
 Examiner, Art Unit 3663

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required